

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON  
AT SEATTLE

NORTHWEST PIPE COMPANY, an Oregon  
corporation,

Plaintiff,

v.

THE PHOENIX INSURANCE COMPANY, a  
foreign insurer authorized by the Washington  
insurance commissioner, and TRAVELERS  
PROPERTY CASUALTY COMPANY OF  
AMERICA, a foreign insurer authorized by the  
Washington insurance commissioner,

Defendants.

Case No.: \_\_\_\_\_

**COMPLAINT FOR DECLARATORY  
RELIEF**

Plaintiff Northwest Pipe Company (“Northwest Pipe”), for its Complaint for Declaratory Relief against defendants The Phoenix Insurance Company and Travelers Property Casualty Company of American (collectively, “Insurers” unless separately specified), alleges as follows:

**I. PARTIES**

1. Plaintiff Northwest Pipe is an Oregon corporation with its principal place of business in the State of Washington.

1           2.       On information and belief, defendant The Phoenix Insurance Company  
2 ("Phoenix") is a company formed under the laws of the State of Connecticut with a principal  
3 place of business in the State of Connecticut, and which is authorized to transact business in  
4 Washington by the Washington insurance commissioner.

5           3.       On information and belief, defendant Travelers Property Casualty Company of  
6 America ("Travelers") is a company formed under the laws of the State of Connecticut with a  
7 principal place of business in the State of Connecticut, and which is authorized to transact  
8 business in Washington by the Washington insurance commissioner.

9           4.       The Insurers are members of the Travelers group of insurance companies.

10                               **II.       VENUE AND JURISDICTION**

11           5.       Jurisdiction is properly before this Court pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1332 *et seq.*,  
12 because the amount in controversy exceeds the sum or value of \$75,000 and is between  
13 citizens of different states.

14           6.       The Court has jurisdiction over this declaratory judgment action pursuant to  
15 28 U.S.C. § 2201 because there is an actual and justiciable controversy between the parties  
16 with respect to the scope and existence of insurance coverage under the insurance policies that  
17 Insurers issued to Northwest Pipe. A judicial determination and declaration of the parties'  
18 respective rights and obligations is necessary and appropriate at this time because Northwest  
19 Pipe currently has no adequate remedy at law that will resolve the current controversy.

20           7.       Venue is proper in this Court pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1391, as this action  
21 involves a dispute over the scope and existence of insurance coverage afforded under policies  
22 written in and issued to an entity based in Washington, events giving rise to this claim  
23  
24  
25  
26

1 occurred in and/or were directed to this district, and because Insurers are subject to this  
 2 Court's personal jurisdiction.

### 3 **III. FACTUAL BACKGROUND**

4 8. This action involves a dispute concerning the scope and existence of coverage  
 5 afforded by policies issued by Insurers to Northwest Pipe for an underlying action captioned  
 6 *Minako America Corporation dba Minco Construction v. County of Los Angeles and*  
 7 *Northwest Pipe Company*, Los Angeles County (California) Superior Court Case No.  
 8 SC127326 (the "Minako Suit"). A true and correct copy of the First Amended Complaint for:  
 9 (1) Breach of Contract; (2) Breach of Implied Warranty; (3) Breach of Subcontract; (4)  
 10 Breach of Warranty; (5) Contractual Indemnity; (6) Equitable Indemnity; and (7) Negligence  
 11 in the Minako Suit (the "FAC") is attached as Exhibit 1 to this Complaint.  
 12

13 9. The Minako Suit arose out of alleged construction defects at the public works  
 14 improvement project commonly known as the Marina Del Rey 18-inch Water Line  
 15 Replacement (the "Project").  
 16

17 10. As alleged in the FAC, the Project included the installation of 2,000 lineal feet  
 18 of water mainline on Via Marina and 4,000 lineal feet of water mainline on Fiji Way, both in  
 19 the City of Marina Del Rey.  
 20

21 11. Northwest Pipe subcontracted with Project general contractor Minako America  
 22 Corporation dba Minco Construction ("Minako") to manufacture and supply "concrete steel  
 23 pipes" to be used in the Project as water mainline.

24 12. Some or all of the concrete steel pipes manufactured and supplied by  
 25 Northwest Pipe were in fact installed in the Project.  
 26

1           13.     The FAC alleges that after the concrete steel pipes manufactured and supplied  
2 by Northwest Pipe were installed in the Project, portions of those concrete steel pipes  
3 developed cracks in their concrete linings.

4           14.     The FAC alleges that due to the alleged cracks in the concrete linings of the  
5 concrete steel pipes manufactured and supplied by Northwest Pipe, those concrete steel pipes  
6 must be removed and replaced with concrete steel pipes without cracks in their concrete  
7 linings.

8           15.     The FAC alleges that various forms of property damage to the Project resulted  
9 from the cracks in the concrete steel pipes manufactured and supplied by Northwest Pipe,  
10 including but not limited to significant Project delays, substantial Project cost increases, the  
11 necessary removal and eventual replacement of installed supplies and completed work  
12 surrounding those concrete steel pipes, and the inability to use the water system that  
13 incorporated those concrete steel pipes and the water contained within that system.

14           16.     The Minako Suit seeks an award of damages against Northwest Pipe because  
15 of the various forms of property damage to the Project caused by Northwest Pipe's alleged  
16 negligence, contractual breaches, warranty breaches, and contractual and equitable indemnity  
17 obligations.

18           17.     For at least the years 2013 through 2016, the Insurers insured Northwest Pipe  
19 under three consecutive general liability policies (collectively, the "Policies"). Specifically:

20           a.       from November 1, 2013 through November 1, 2014, Travelers insured  
21 Northwest Pipe under general liability policy number Y-660-226D0451-TIL-13;  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26

1           b.       from November 1, 2014 through November 1, 2015, Travelers insured  
2 Northwest Pipe under general liability policy number Y-660-226D0451-TIL-14; and

3           c.       from November 1, 2015 through November 1, 2016, Phoenix insured  
4 Northwest Pipe under general liability policy number Y-660-226D0451-TIL-15.

5           18.     The Policies generally insure Northwest Pipe for and against third-party suits  
6 seeking an award of damages because of, among other things, “property damage” caused by  
7 an “occurrence,” subject to certain conditions, exclusions and other policy provisions. True  
8 and correct copies of the Policies are attached as Exhibits 2, 3 & 4 to this Complaint.

9           19.     The Policies obligate the Insurers to defend and indemnify Northwest Pipe  
10 against third-party suits seeking covered damages.

11           20.     The Minako Suit seeks, among other things, an award of covered damages  
12 because of property damage caused by an occurrence, to which no exclusions or coverage  
13 limitations in the Policies apply. The Minako Suit therefore triggers Northwest Pipe’s right to  
14 both a defense and indemnification under the Policies. Thus, after the Minako Suit was  
15 filed, Northwest Pipe tendered that suit to Insurers for both a defense and indemnification.

16           21.     Insurers initially accepted Northwest Pipe’s tender and agreed to defend  
17 Northwest Pipe against the Minako Suit pursuant to a reservation of the purported right to  
18 deny coverage for any damages ultimately awarded against Northwest Pipe in the Minako  
19 under various policy exclusions and limitations. A true and correct copy of Insurers’  
20 reservation of rights letter to Northwest Pipe is attached as Exhibit 5 to this Complaint.  
21 Insurers subsequently agreed to approve and appoint attorney Thomas Vincent of the law firm  
22 of Payne & Fears LLP as Northwest Pipe’s defense counsel for the Minako Suit.  
23  
24  
25  
26

1           22. Northwest Pipe has continuously cooperated with Insurers throughout the  
2 defense of the Minako Suit.

3           23. During the course of the Minako Suit, Insurers have asserted that they have no  
4 duty to indemnify Northwest Pipe against any of its potential liability in the Minako Suit.

5           24. Washington law governs the substantive coverage issues in this action.  
6  
7 Because Northwest Pipe believes and contends that under Washington law it is entitled to  
8 indemnification, including reasonable settlement funding, for the Minako Suit, Northwest  
9 Pipe now brings this declaratory judgment action seeking a judicial determination that one or  
10 both Insurers owe a duty to indemnify Northwest Pipe for the claims asserted in the Minako  
11 Suit, and thus fund any reasonable settlement that may come available during the course of  
12 that suit.

13  
14                   **IV. CAUSE OF ACTION – DECLARATORY RELIEF**

15           25. Northwest Pipe realleges and reincorporates by reference all allegations of  
16 paragraphs 1 through 24 of this Complaint as if set forth fully herein.

17           26. Insurers' refusal to acknowledge their duty to indemnify Northwest Pipe  
18 against the Minako Suit and their resulting refusal to accept Northwest Pipe's indemnification  
19 tender of that suit has created an actual controversy between Northwest Pipe and Insurers  
20 concerning their respective rights and obligations under the Policies.

21           27. Northwest Pipe seeks a judicial determination and declaration of Insurers'  
22 respective duties with respect to the indemnification of Northwest Pipe in the Minako Suit,  
23 and specifically requests that the Court declare that Insurers have owed and continue to owe a  
24  
25  
26

1 duty to indemnify Northwest Pipe for any liability imposed upon or reasonable settlement  
2 reached by Northwest Pipe in that suit.

3 28. Upon prevailing upon this cause of action, Northwest Pipe will be entitled to  
4 recover its reasonable attorney fees incurred in this action pursuant to Washington's *Olympic*  
5 *Steamship* doctrine.  
6

7 **V. PRAYER FOR RELIEF**

8 WHEREFORE, Northwest Pipe prays this Court to enter judgment in favor of  
9 Northwest Pipe and against Insurers and to issue a declaration settling the respective rights  
10 and obligations of the parties with respect to the Minako Suit, as follows:

11 A. Northwest Pipe is entitled to full coverage for the Minako Suit, including  
12 indemnification for any adverse judgment entered against Northwest Pipe or reasonable  
13 settlement reached by Northwest Pipe at the conclusion of that suit;  
14

15 B. Awarding to Northwest Pipe its costs of suit;

16 C. Awarding to Northwest Pipe its reasonable attorney fees and litigation  
17 expenses for this action pursuant to Washington's *Olympic Steamship* doctrine; and

18 D. Awarding such other relief to which Northwest Pipe is entitled in law and  
19 equity.  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26

1 Dated: September 2, 2021

BUCHALTER

2  
3 By: /s/ Bradley Hoff

4 Bradley Hoff, WSBA # 23974  
5 1420 Fifth Avenue, Suite 3100  
6 Seattle, WA 98101-1337  
7 T: 206.319.7052  
8 E: bhoff@buchalter.com

9 By: /s/ Ann Y. Gong

10 Ann Y. Gong, WSBA #50864  
11 1420 Fifth Avenue, Suite 3100  
12 Seattle, WA 98101-1337  
13 T: 206.319.7052  
14 E: agong@buchalter.com

15 *Attorneys for Plaintiff*  
16 NORTHWEST PIPE COMPANY  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26